UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/934,479	08/23/2001	Yoko Fujiwara	018656-241	8426	
Platon N. Mand	7590 09/03/200 lros	EXAMINER			
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.			BRIER, JEFFERY A		
P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/03/2008	PAPER	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/934,479	FUJIWARA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffery A. Brier	2628
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron e, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 ≥ 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4)	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat Prity documents have been receiv Bu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal I 6)  Other:	oate

Application/Control Number: 09/934,479 Page 2

Art Unit: 2628

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/16/2008 has been entered.

### Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed on 06/16/2008 has been entered.

### Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 06/16/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with regards to claims 33 and 34 since claim 34 occurs before the extracting step and the detecting step of claim 32 occurs before the extracting step, thus, the marked document blocks and the perimeter appear to be the same mark, however, the claim is unclear.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2628

5. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-34, 37-40, and 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, 17, 27, 32, and 33:

These independent claims claim "marked by the user on a scanned document" while the specification at page 9 lines 12-23 describes "this mark is added to the document by the user beforehand using marker such as a felt-tip pen or the like.", lines 19-21. The claims appear to be claiming the document is marked after the document is scanned, while the specification only conveys marking the document before the document is scanned. The dependent claims do not correct this issue.

Claims 18, 21, and 24:

These claims each claim "marked portion of the layout image", where the claimed layout image is not the scanned document, thus, for the reasons given above concerning the mark added by the user before scanning the document the specification fails to convey these claims.

Claims 19, 22, and 25:

These claims each claim "the extracted document block is a headline and body text of the layout image", where the claimed layout image is not the scanned document, thus, for the reasons given above concerning the mark added by the user before scanning the document the specification fails to convey these claims.

Application/Control Number: 09/934,479 Page 4

Art Unit: 2628

Claims 33 and 34:

Since the perimeter marking, see claim 34, occurs before the extracting step and the detecting step of claim 32 occurs before the extracting step and since the marked document blocks and the perimeter may be different claimed marks and since the specification only describes one mark, see the specification at page 9 lines 12-23, the specification fails to convey these claims.

Claims 37-40:

These claims each claim "the layout image includes at least one image in an area outside the document block". Since the layout image is formed from the marked area, see the specification at page 9 lines 12-23, then the specification fails to convey "the layout image includes at least one image in an area outside the document block".

- 6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 7. Claims 8, 14-16, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8 and 16:

These dependent claims do not clearly add to their parent claims since claimed a "scanned document" and these claims claim "reading an image" but are unclear if the read image is the scanned document.

Claims 14-16:

These dependent claims each claim "wherein image processing further comprises" which lacks antecedent basis because "image processing" was not claimed in parent claim 9.

Claim 33:

Lines 3-4 and 12-14 conflict with each other since it is not clear if the user selection at lines 3-4 and the perimeter are the same and if they are being established by the user beforehand at lines 12-14.

Claim 34:

This dependent claim of claim 33 has the same conflicting issue.

#### Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffery A. Brier whose telephone number is (571) 272-7656. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 7:30 to 4:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached at (571) 272-7664. The fax phone Number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number: 09/934,479 Page 6

Art Unit: 2628

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jeffery A. Brier/ Primary Examiner, Division 2628